

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
15 FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON

16 FRED A. LARSEN,

O R D E R  
No. 6:11-cv-6415-TC

17 Plaintiff,

18 vs.

19 MICHAEL J. ASTRUE, Commissioner  
20 Social Security Administration,

21 Defendant.  
22

AIKEN, Chief Judge:


23 Magistrate Judge Coffin filed his Findings and  
24 Recommendation on December 4, 2012. The matter is now before me  
25 pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b).  
26 When a party objects to any portion of the Magistrate's Findings  
27 and Recommendation, the district court must make a de novo  
28

1 determination of that portion of the Magistrate's report. 28  
2 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B); McDonnell Douglas Corp. v. Commodore  
3 Business Machines, 656 F.2d 1309, 1313 (9th Cir. 1981), cert.  
4 denied, 455 U.S. 920 (1982).

5 Plaintiff has timely filed objections. I have, therefore,  
6 given the file of this case a de novo review. I ADOPT the  
7 Magistrate's Findings and Recommendation (doc. 22) and affirm the  
8 Commissioner's decision.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED.

10 Dated this 5<sup>th</sup> day of February ~~January~~ 2013.

11  
12  
13  
14   
15 Ann Aiken  
16 United States District Judge  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28